



CONSULTATION RESPONSE

APACS Performance and Diagnostic Indicators for 2008/09: *Technical Consultation*

Police and Crime Standards Directorate
May 2008

INTRODUCTION

A technical consultation on the indicators and structure of the new Assessments of Policing and Community Safety (APACS) framework was held between 7 December 2007 and 18 January 2008. This report sets out the progress made to date in response to that consultation, and provides feedback on the issues raised.

The APACS technical consultation received a range of views, suggestions and issues from a number of stakeholders which have influenced, and will continue to inform, the development of the APACS framework. APACS went live in April 2008, and 2008/09 will form the first year of APACS assessment. However the Home Office and partners are committed to ensuring that APACS continues to develop in order to meet its strategic aims, and to ensure that ongoing developments can be taken into account.

The Technical Consultation paper set out proposals and sought views on the performance indicators to be used in APACS, its framework structure and data definitions. It asked a number of specific questions which were summarised under three key headings:

- Framework Structure;
- Proposed Headline Performance Indicators; and,
- Proposed Diagnostic Indicators.

We recognise and apologise that it has taken longer than anticipated to publish this response. However, in order to ensure that the indicator set and associated definitions were available for 2008/09, work to date has focussed on the finalisation of both the statutory instrument, under which the headline indicators have been set, and the associated technical guidance. Work to develop and deliver APACS continues to be overseen by the APACS Steering Group. In addition, PCSD have been working closely with the (Department of) Communities and Local Government (CLG) to finalise the National Indicator Set for Local Government in England, which includes relevant APACS indicators. Work has also been ongoing to consider and discuss how APACS will apply in Wales, reflecting the differing accountability arrangements for some partners. This is discussed in more detail in section 1.

Finally, but most importantly, the Home Office would like to thank everyone who responded to the Technical Consultation. We look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure that APACS underpins the continuing delivery of policing and community safety services to the public.

Queries and further information

Please email: APACSdevelopment@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk
or go to web page: <http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/apacs>

1: OVERVIEW OF RESPONSES

This section provides a summary of who responded, and also outlines the additional engagement that has taken place to inform technical development.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The formal technical consultation period ran for six weeks. However, to supplement the formal consultation and as part of wider stakeholder engagement, a number of supporting events were held alongside a number of established and ongoing fora.

1.2 We received a total of 92 responses over the six week period to the Technical Consultation, including:

- ACPO (on behalf of Police Forces), plus 21 responses from individual Police Forces;
- APA (on behalf of Police Authorities), plus 7 from individual Police Authorities;
- 7 from other organisations represented on the Steering Group;
- 27 from Local Government; and,
- 28 from other bodies, including other Government departments, regional Government Offices, Fire & Rescue authorities, and representatives of the banking and financial sectors.

SUPPORTING EVENTS

1.3 PCSD continues to work closely with partners through a number of established fora, including the APACS Steering Group, Technical Group and User Group, and other partner-led fora including the Local Priorities Board and CLG-led groups considering the implementation of the Local Government White Paper. Prior to the consultation itself, a number of “expert reviews” were held to consider issues relating to each of the domains.

1.4 In addition to regular fora and dialogue with key partners, a number of events were held to support the consultation, including APACS Regional Consultation meetings in the 9 Government Office regions of England and with the All Wales Community Safety Forum. As a result, the views of delegates that attended these regional events, boards and meetings have also been factored into this report.

1.5 The development of APACS has benefited greatly from discussion with, and input from, a Steering Group comprising a wide range of key stakeholders. The group includes representatives of the Home Office, the Association of Chief Police Officers

(ACPO), the Association of Police Authorities (APA), Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC), the Local Government Association (LGA), the Audit Commission, the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG), HM Treasury, the Ministry of Justice, the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA), the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit, the Metropolitan Police Service, the Metropolitan Police Authority, the Welsh Assembly Government and regional Government Offices. APACS will continue to be developed in close consultation with these Steering Group members.

1.6 In August 2007 a series of regional events were organised in conjunction with Government Offices to raise awareness of APACS with key policing stakeholders. The events provided information on the aims and current development status of the programme, alerted the audiences to the forthcoming consultation process and sought early feedback. As a consequence, it was agreed to run an additional series of regional consultation workshops as part of the process. These took place in December 2007 and January 2008, and proved to be invaluable in gaining an insight into issues, concerns and views on what APACS should include. The regional events were particularly constructive in allowing performance managers in partner organisations to have their say. We also benefited from the input of the Performance Assessment Technical Group, the APACS User Group and from informal contact with individual stakeholders. Representation was also received from the Lifting the Burdens Task Force.

1.7 The Technical Consultation was complemented by a similar consultation exercise by (The Department for) Communities and Local Government (CLG) on indicators in the National Indicator Set (NIS) for local government and local government partners in England, and by a longer twelve week consultation which focused on wider 'Strategic' performance management arrangements for APACS. CLG also conducted a separate consultation exercise in relation to the Place Survey, and the Audit Commission have been consulting on the development of Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA).

WALES

1.8 We recognise that the policing partnership landscape is different in Wales and, following liaison with Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) officials, we undertook a series of presentations, encouraged partner stakeholders to respond to the consultation process and engaged with Wales ACPO and the All Wales Community Safety Forum.

1.9 Whilst local government arrangements are not the same as in England, we do not foresee any significant barriers to the operation of APACS within Wales. We are aware that some limited data will not be available for Wales (primarily relating to the Place Survey) and will be mindful of this and other differences as we further develop APACS in partnership over the coming months. We are committed to continued dialogue with WAG and other Welsh partners as APACS development continues.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1.10 An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) of the APACS framework is ongoing and, as a first stage, an initial EIA report was produced by the Police Equality and Diversity Policy Unit in the Home Office's Police Productivity Unit. The exercise was positive, and also provided an opportunity – through consultation – to increase the awareness of equality and fairness issues surrounding APACS from the stakeholder points of view. The initial report has made 7 recommendations for consideration and implementation.

1.11 To support the process, an Equality and Fairness workshop was held in London in August 2007. The workshop was considered a suitable way to provide community representatives with an insight into the reasons for introducing a new performance framework. Furthermore, it provided community delegates with an opportunity to discuss their concerns, issues and needs from the community perspective. The Home Office would like to thank those who contributed to the process, in particular Doreen Lawrence, who attended the first meeting, and to Peter Fahy, representing the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO), for their experiences and insight.

1.12 The overall reaction to the EIA of APACS was positive, from the responses received from the Support Staff Association and External Stakeholders meetings, and information gleaned from the Technical and Strategic consultations held.

1.13 Of the SPIs and KDIs within the consultation document, 60% of the indicators were regarded positively, with only 3% viewed negatively (and the rest deemed neutral). However, it was generally felt that issues relating performance measurement and equality and fairness had been examined before, and stakeholders felt that greater monitoring and feedback on how views had been taken into account would be welcome. The ongoing delivery plan for APACS includes evaluation and consultation in respect of existing and proposed measures. The Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs) were seen as an important tool for ensuring that elements of equality and fairness could be monitored to ensure that improvements in service delivery were not being achieved to the detriment of particular groups.

1.14 The SPI proposal that was viewed negatively within the EIA was the proposed efficiency measure. This indicator has been retained, since it reflects force performance against targets which have already been agreed, and which underpin the efficiency and productivity strategy. The negative perspective emanated from concerns that, in any efficiency saving activity, equality and diversity programmes were often the first to be cut. However, the target is for efficiency and productivity gains, getting more per pound spent, not for expenditure reductions. This concern is further mitigated by the statutory duty of public authorities to screen all policies for relevance to race disability and gender and carry out a full equality impact assessment if relevance is found.

1.15 The initial Equality Impact Assessment report is published alongside this consultation response.

2: FRAMEWORK STRUCTURE

This section considers feedback relating to the overall structure of APACS.

INTRODUCTION

2.1 The consultation paper asked a number of questions relating to the basic structure of the framework, including the rationale, coverage and scope of the proposed domains. It also considered the name of the framework.

FRAMEWORK TITLE

Q1. *We believe that the title ‘Assessments of Policing and Community Safety’ best summarises what the framework is intended to assess. Views on any preferred alternative are invited.*

Comments & Suggestions

2.2 A number of suggestions for alternative titles were put forward. Some respondents felt that there was potential for confusion with the UK Payments Association, and others felt the title should be amended to explicitly refer to “partnerships”. However, other stakeholders felt that the name “APACS” had already become known and embedded with policing stakeholders, and that a change in name at this stage would be likely to cause confusion.

Decisions and Rationale

2.3 The APACS Steering Group considered the alternative names put forward, and endorsed the original proposal of APACS. This primarily reflects that the name is now well established with stakeholders and partners.

2.4 The framework will therefore be called APACS – Assessments of Policing and Community Safety.

FRAMEWORK STRUCTURE, DOMAIN DEFINITIONS, TITLES AND SCOPE

Q2. *Following stakeholder events over the summer, we believe that the five domains provide an understandable and helpful structure to underpin a balanced view of performance across policing and community safety. Views on any preferred alternative for the domain titles and/or domain structure are invited.*

Q3. *The definitions and scope at Annex B are advocated following significant consultation with stakeholders. Views on these are invited, with a particular focus on the scope proposed for each domain (especially key omissions or issues which should be omitted or considered as part of another domain).*

Comments & Suggestions:

2.5 It was generally accepted that indicators should be grouped into domains, such that assessments of individual components can be aggregated to obtain a summary view, and to communicate that view to non-specialists. Generally, respondents felt that the five domains provide an understandable and helpful structure, but need further refinement.

2.6 A number of specific suggestions were made regarding the proposed “domains” for APACS. In particular, some partners felt that the *Promoting Safety* domain, as outlined in the consultation paper, suffered from being smaller than the other domains, and one response suggested that all domains should be equally sized. In some of the consultation events, stakeholders suggested that the indicators within *Promoting Safety* could be merged into other domains to create a four domain model. This also reflected some views that this domain is poorly defined and overlaps to an unacceptable level with other domains.

2.7 Concerns were raised by partners about the “police focused” nature of the *Organisational Management* domain. Several stakeholders suggested that the scope of the domain should be broadened out to cover non-police organisations, and a number of stakeholders suggested that an assessment against the national standards for Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) should be included within the framework. Others suggested removing the *Organisational Management* domain completely, to focus solely on outcomes.

2.8 A number of suggestions for alternative domain names were put forward. These included:

- a. For ‘Promoting Safety’ – *Promoting Community Safety, Quality of Life*
- b. For ‘Tackling Crime’ - *Tackling Crime and Re-Offending*
- c. For ‘Serious Crime and Protection’ - *Serious Crime and Public Protection*
- d. For ‘Confidence and Satisfaction’ - *Public Confidence and Satisfaction*
- e. For ‘Organisational Management’ - *Managing Capability and Capacity, Police Organisational Management*

Decisions and Rationale:

2.9 The APACS Steering Group considered the various issues relating to domains. In doing so the group felt that it was important to recognise that further strategic development of the framework (for example, covering how published assessments will be made, and the role of non-indicator components within the framework) may

influence views on domain structure/scope, and thus future refinement may be required.

2.10 The group considered the specific recommendation to include an assessment of CDRPs against the national standards/hallmarks of effective partnership working in the *Organisational Management* domain, to extend the scope of the domain beyond the police. Whilst the Steering Group were supportive of the principles of the national standards, concerns were raised about the potential bureaucratic requirement of mandating such an assessment across all 370 CDRPs, which it felt would be at odds with the commitments made in the Local Government White Paper. The Group felt that the standards would be better considered as a diagnostic tool once poor performance had been identified within a local area. This would then free high-performing partnerships from that requirement to assess and report to the centre. It was also noted that whilst the Home Office can hold local areas to account on performance on crime and community safety issues, some members of the partnerships were directly accountable to other parts of government for their use of resources and issues related to organisational management.

2.11 The group considered whether the five domain structure was appropriate, or whether the *Promoting Safety* domain should be subsumed elsewhere to create a four domain model. Having considered that: the full operational model of APACS had not been completed; the desire to consider other components/indicators covering lower level crime and disorder; the importance of anti-social behaviour and – for example – neighbourhood policing; and anecdotal evidence that the proposed model has already been adopted by some forces and authorities, the group endorsed the five domain model.

2.12 The group also considered some of the alternative names put forward. However, again reflecting the currency of the existing proposals, the group felt that it was appropriate to retain the current names for operational purposes, but noted that the names could be reconsidered when evaluating options for publication of APACS assessments.

2.13 The five domain model is therefore adopted, with an opportunity for further revision as the strategic development of APACS continues. Titles for the domains remain unchanged at present, but can be reconsidered as part of the development of public-facing assessments.

3: PROPOSED HEADLINE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

This section considers feedback relating to the proposed headline indicators (known as Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs)).

INTRODUCTION

3.1 The main focus of the Technical Consultation paper was the proposed set of headline Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) for 2008/09. The following section outlines responses to the consultation relating to the SPI set.

3.2 Final decisions on the SPI set for 2008/09 were taken by Ministers, following consideration of stakeholder views. In coming to final decisions, Ministers were particularly mindful of the national priorities for policing and community safety as articulated in the new Public Service Agreements (PSAs).

HEADLINE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

- Q4.** *The indicators proposed stem from work with stakeholders to develop and identify those for inclusion in the framework. Stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on whether the proposed set of indicators is the right one, but in particular whether there are:*
- o key gaps – i.e. indicators that have not been proposed but which should be*
 - o duplications – i.e. where more than one indicator substantively covers the same issue or*
 - o revisions needed – where indicators need amending or defining differently*
- and also to consider whether the allocation to domains and overall balance of indicators is correct.*
- Q5.** *Recognising that indicators linked to PSAs and the national indicator set have been agreed by Ministers, views are invited on the details of indicators at Annex G.*
- Q6.** *Stakeholders are invited to submit proposals for areas of delivery for which a headline performance indicator has not yet been developed, which could be considered for future development of APACS (e.g. for inclusion from 2009/10).*

Background

3.3 The headline indicators (SPIs – Statutory Performance Indicators) for APACS for 2008/09 reflect the national priorities for policing. Whilst the indicator set was subject to consultation, Ministers retain the right to set indicators for those areas of policing that they feel should be priorities. As such, the proposed indicator set – as set out in the consultation – included indicators for areas within both PSAs and the National Indicator Set (for Local Government in England). Some stakeholders felt that presumed inclusion of those indicators within APACS bypassed the consultation. However, whilst the Government retains the right to set such indicators, stakeholder

feedback has helped to shape the definitions of those indicators, and – in some instances – indicators have been delayed so that further consideration can be given to their development. In addition, the PSAs were developed with the involvement of tripartite partners, and the NIS reflects the top priorities identified by Cabinet for local government working alone or in partnership.

Comments & Suggestions

3.4 A significant number of comments, suggestions and concerns were raised in relation to the individual indicators proposed for inclusion for 2008/09. These are considered in greater depth – by domain – in this response. However, a number of common themes raised by stakeholders are considered here.

3.5 The opportunity afforded by the introduction of APACS, and the aim to simplify performance frameworks and create a single framework covering Home Office business, resulted in a proposed indicator set containing many new indicators, some of which are from new data sources. Many stakeholders raised concerns about new data streams and related data quality issues, and in particular many policing stakeholders raised concerns about quality assurance of partner data. Additionally, concerns were raised about some indicators where data would be available too infrequently or at too high a geographical level to service local accountability and decision-making. Particular concerns were raised about survey measures, and in particular the Place Survey (see section 5).

3.6 Reflecting the newness of certain data streams, many practitioners have asked for early sight of relevant data and analyses through iQuanta to assist performance management. Many practitioners are concerned that an increased focus on data from non-policing partners makes local performance monitoring more difficult, and concerns were raised by several policing partners about the arrangements for data collection and data quality assurance from partner organisations.

3.7 Concerns were also raised that the publication of information or assessments relating to counter terrorism and domestic extremism might damage public confidence, and could potentially provide apparent ‘intelligence’ to potential offenders.

3.8 In terms of the proposed suite of indicators within APACS, a number of possible gaps were identified through the consultation. In particular, the main identified gaps included criminal damage, fraud, alcohol, crimes against businesses and professional standards / complaints.

Decisions and Rationale

3.9 Concerns about the quality of assurance of data streams are well noted, particularly following PCSD’s announcement in early 2007 that it would no longer continue to fund a comprehensive programme of data quality assurance. Amobi Modu wrote to forces and authorities in February 2008 to outline plans for data quality to take place with regard to 07/08 data (covering the final publication under

the previous PPAF framework). PCSD is now considering how data quality might be assured in future, with a particular focus on data underpinning the new PSAs.

3.10 To assist local planning and performance monitoring, PCSD have added a timetable to iQuanta, setting out when the SPIs within APACS for 2008/09 will become available. However, local partners are reminded of the statutory duty to share data locally, and the recent guidance to effective partnership working¹ also sets out more detail on how to establish effective data sharing protocols at the local level, which should support regular, frequent performance monitoring activity locally.

3.11 It is recognised that CT indicators are new and that some caution is needed. There is no intention to publish information and assessments in relation to CT and domestic extremism other than the arrangements which are currently used to identify the broad number of threats facing the UK, the security response to those threats and interventions including those that result in a criminal justice disposal. Arrangements are being developed to store data in a secure environment which will allow its subsequent development and assessment to be made available to appropriate practitioners in the furtherance of public security.

3.12 The Home Office has taken into account that this data could potentially be used as a means of intelligence by offenders and (as stated above) will employ suitable safeguards to ensure that the capture of data, analysis and storage will be appropriate. For the period 2008-09 these measures will be operated on a developmental basis and will be subject to regular evaluation. This will allow development of policy in relation to their use and of a secure storage medium (as outlined above).

3.13 The APACS Steering Group was asked to review the main gaps identified by stakeholders, and to consider whether indicators should be added or developed for future inclusion. The Steering Group felt that the coverage of the proposed indicators was appropriate, and that the desire to keep the indicator set as small and manageable as possible was important. This in part reflected the number of 'placeholders' for development for 2009/10. However, given the concern about the lack of a focus on fraud, and the significant representation received from the banking and financial sector, Ministers have agreed to trial an indicator of Sanction Detection rate for fraud, for possible inclusion in 2009/10.

3.14 PCSD will continue to consider how best to quality assure all data within the APACS framework, working with partners, and will keep the development of CT measures under review. We also continue to encourage partners to establish effective mechanisms locally for sharing data, consistent with the new information sharing regulations. An indicator for fraud will be trialed in 2008/09, for possible future inclusion.

¹ Delivering Safer Communities: A Guide to Effective Partnership Working (Home Office, Sept 2007)

PROMOTING SAFETY

Comments & Suggestions

3.15 Stakeholders were extremely concerned over the use of data from the **Place Survey**, although the value of data at a more local geographical level was welcomed. However, stakeholders were generally of the view that the Place Survey needed further development on methodology, sample size, frequency and costs, before data could be considered for inclusion.

3.16 There was particular concern that biennial data would not be frequent enough and the time taken to process the data would be too long for it to be of any use for performance management. Furthermore, the postal response rates would be low, and those choosing to respond would not be a representative sample. The incomparability of data between the BCS and the Place Survey was raised as an issue, and it was also noted that the Place Survey will not take place in Wales.

3.17 It was noted that **local anti-social behaviour priorities** may not be the same as the seven strands proposed for the indicator, and therefore survey results may not reflect the real concerns of the local population. Conversely, it was felt that localising the survey would mean that the results would not be directly comparable nationally.

3.18 Concerns were raised that the **drugs and alcohol perceptions** indicators were sub-sets of the **anti-social behaviour** indicator and therefore created double-counting. Some stakeholders therefore felt that those two indicators should be diagnostics.

3.19 For the SPI on **Deliberate Fires**, concerns were raised about the role played by the police in delivering performance in this area, reflecting that the NIS indicator is based on fire service data which covers a wider range of incidents compared to police crime data. Some felt that this indicator would be better sited in the *Tackling Crime* Domain.

3.20 The APACS and NIS consultations each proposed slightly different versions of indicators relating to **Road Casualties**. The APACS proposal was for a continuation of the existing PPAF indicator, measured with reference to vehicle kilometres travelled. The NIS indicator (put forward by the Department for Transport (DfT)) focused on change over time in casualty numbers. Stakeholders were generally supportive of continuation of the vehicle km measure, but some partners were keen to ensure alignment with the proposed NIS (DfT) measure.

Decisions and Rationale

3.21 Issues and concerns relating to the Place Survey are well recognised (see section 5 for more information).

3.22 The drug and alcohol perception measures are key PSA indicators for PSA 25 (*“Reduce the Harm Caused by Alcohol and Drugs”*). Problem drug use and harmful alcohol use have a significant impact on local communities and the purpose of these indicators will be to drive down the harm caused to communities by alcohol and drug related disorder. As a result, the Home Office felt that it was essential to have SPIs in place for these key drivers of associated crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour in order to ensure that they remain priorities for local action.

3.23 The deliberate fires indicator has been identified for inclusion in the National Indicator Set, recognising that it is one of the priorities given for local government either alone or in partnership. Given that there is a role for the police in delivering the outcome of reducing such incidents, and APACS reflects wider community safety outcomes, and the principle to ensure that partner frameworks are appropriately aligned the Home Office felt that the deliberate fire measure should feature in APACS.

3.24 In relation to the traffic casualty measure, although the Home continues to believe that a casualties indicator utilising traffic volume is a better measure, there is the need to align APACS and the National Indicator Set (NIS) for Local Government in England. As a result, and following representation from the ACPO lead on roads policing, the decision was made to define the indicator over time in line with the NIS. (NB This decision was taken after the Statutory Instrument (SI) had been laid. The SI therefore contains both indicators).

TACKLING CRIME

3.25 The consultation responses covered significant points of detail on individual indicators and related to the comprehensiveness and purpose of the domain.

Comments & Suggestions

3.26 Some concerns were raised about the **title of certain indicators**, for example whether the offences included within Serious Acquisitive Crime are truly “serious”. Some concerns were also raised about the coverage of certain indicators, and in particular the inclusion of theft from vehicles and exclusion of commercial burglary. It was also suggested that fraud should count within **serious acquisitive crime**.

3.27 Stakeholders supported the aspiration to give prominence to measures of **hate crime and domestic violence**, but raised concerns about whether systems (e.g. Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARACS)) and data collection processes are sufficiently established to support the measures.

3.28 There was some confusion over the potential overlap between the proposed measure of **assault with injury** and the measure (within the Serious Crime and Protection domain) of **serious violent crime**. Stakeholders also requested greater clarity over **measures of re-offending**, with particular concerns raised about data sources. Some stakeholders were also opposed to measures based around “cohorts” of offenders.

3.29 Stakeholders accepted the need to track **disproportionality within the CJS**, but expressed doubt over whether the proposed measure of CJS disproportionality could be quantified.

3.30 A number of concerns were raised about the number of **diagnostic indicators identified for PPO schemes**. This is considered in more detail in section 4, but in part reflects the creation of the single APACS framework to replace several previous frameworks used by the Home Office.

Decisions and Rationale

3.31 Throughout the domain there is now a focus on Offences Brought To Justice (OBTJ) rates as headline measures, with sanction detection rates included only as diagnostic indicators. This reinforces the links to PSA24 (*“Deliver a more effective, transparent and responsive Criminal Justice System for victims and the public”*), and is consistent with measures used for other partners, particularly the CPS, which reinforces a partnership approach. A diagnostic indicator has also been included, which reflects the efficiency (or rate of waste) in cases presented to CPS for decision. This is also consistent with the recommendation from the Flanagan review, to ensure alignment of measurement between the police and the CPS.

3.32 The measures of serious acquisitive crime (crime rates and OBTJ rates), adult and youth re-offending and the involvement of young people in the CJS are all required to support local tracking of national PSA outcomes. These indicators have therefore been retained within the framework. Wherever possible, definitions and data sources have been clarified and tightened. While there could be ‘perverse incentives’ if any one of these indicators was pursued in isolation, as a complementary set of indicators they emphasise the balance needed in the CJS processes to reduce crime and tackle offending.

3.33 The implementation of measures of domestic violence enforcement and repeat victimisation have been deferred until new data streams can be established for domestic violence crimes and the MARAC programme is more extensively rolled out. The implementation of outcome measures on hate crime have also been deferred until data streams can be established. In the meantime, a proxy measure has been introduced for 2008/09 which reports on sanction detection rates for hate crime. The Steering Group supported the inclusion of an indicator on hate crime, which made use of available information, but felt that data collection processes should be enforced if necessary, reflecting the importance of this data.

3.34 With regard to assaults, the title of the indicator (assaults with less serious injury) has been clarified, as has the definition of offences included.

3.35 For PPO re-offending, the indicator has been defined to take account of variability between PPO schemes across the country. For this measure and for the Adult and Youth re-offending measure, the technical guidance has clarified the relevant data sources (PNC, YOTs and JTrack). The Drug-related offending

indicator, which complements at local level the national outcome indicator in PSA 25, has been delayed for introduction in 2009/10 to enable the methodology to be further developed to provide a more robust measure at local level.

3.36 It was recognised that the PSA outcome regarding race equality in the CJS is not readily quantifiable as a numerical indicator. Instead, we are seeking to include a qualitative view within any published assessment which reflects the extent to which LCJBs have gathered, analysed and responded to data on race disproportionality.

3.37 As noted in paragraph 3.13, an additional diagnostic measure on fraud investigation has been added as an interim step while an appropriate headline fraud measure is considered.

SERIOUS CRIME AND PROTECTION

3.38 The Technical Consultation recognised that this domain represented aspirations to measure performance in some areas of policing and community safety which were by nature highly complex and less easily quantifiable than other areas of policing and community safety. Some aspects of this domain focus on areas of policing not previously measured which have a developing policy and delivery structure, such as counter terrorism. In response to these new areas of measurement the consultation document proposed developing indicators (KDIs) which would be trialled and evaluated during the first year and not used for assessment and publication. These have been dealt with separately below for clarity.

Comments & Suggestions

3.39 Stakeholders felt that the number of **domestic, honour and mental health homicide** numbers were too small, making it difficult to make meaningful comparisons, and that they should not be included as indicators.

3.40 Concerns were expressed about the different definitions of **serious violence** within the framework, and the need to align all the measures with the PSA definition.

3.41 Stakeholders saw value in aligning the offences which contributed to the **knife and gun crime** SPIs. Concern was also expressed about the wide and interpretable definition of knife crime - particularly the inclusion of glass, bottles and pointed instruments, and some felt that the indicator should be limited to only incidents where knives are used.

3.42 For **support to victims of serious sexual violence**, respondents questioned whether the focus of the measure was right and whether the data would be comprehensively available from April 2008.

3.43 Concerns were raised that the data requirement for the **sex offender re-offending rate** did not align with the data being collected from April 2008 and also that the numbers would be too low to make comparisons meaningful.

3.44 There was little support for the **strategic roads policing** (ANPR) measures as the majority of respondents felt that these measures were output (rather than outcome) focussed, and were management information at best.

3.45 There was general support from stakeholders for measuring the **disruption impact on organised criminal groups** but concerns were expressed about achieving clarity of definitions and future data quality assurance in this area.

3.46 Specifically in relation to **resilience to violent extremism** (NIS 35), concern was expressed about focusing solely on Muslim communities and not on wider community cohesion.

Decisions and Rationale

3.47 The honour and mental health indicators have been withdrawn. The domestic homicide SPI has been retained because Ministers felt that domestic violence was too important an outcome to not be covered by the SPI set.

3.48 Wherever possible the offences which are included in indicators which use the term 'serious violence' have been aligned with the definition of serious violence from the PSA (Public Service Agreement). It has not been possible to completely align the gun and knife crime measure with the PSA definition as the Home Office had already set the ADR for 2008/09 (in consultation with tripartite partners) to cover a wider scope of offences linked to guns and knives such as robbery.

3.49 Consideration was given to the use of numbers of crimes as a denominator for gun-crime instead of population, but population was retained as the central concern is the prevalence of gun-crime and not just the proportion of offences in which a firearm is used. Total population (rather than 18+) has been used to retain consistency with other crime measures.

3.50 It was not possible to align the offences which contribute to the knife and gun crime SPIs as the ADR was already set for 08/09. Future data requirements will be reviewed for these issues.

3.51 Reflecting concerns, greater clarity and explanation has been provided for the final definition of knife crime. However the Home Office wants to take an inclusive approach to the offences included in this indicator rather than limit measurement to incidents where only knives have been used.

3.52 The support to victims of serious sexual violence measure will be reported on from the new sexual assault referral centres currently being rolled out. To enable the completion of this process and the set up of the appropriate data streams the proposed SPI focusing on victims of serious sexual violence has been deferred for a year.

3.53 The sex offender re-offending rate has been dropped as an SPI. In addition, the indicators relating to strategic roads policing (ANPR) have been removed from the framework.

3.54 There has been considerable feedback, discussion and ongoing interaction in relation to the development of the original eight terrorism indicators. Policy leads and the APACS team have collaborated with colleagues from ACPO (TAM), SO15, MPS performance specialists, personnel from the Regional CTIUs and CTUs, the Security Services, HMIC and other Force representatives. The original eight terrorism indicators have been reduced to six which have all undergone further refinement and have recently been agreed by the Police Counter Terrorism Board.

Further development

3.55 Greater clarity and explanation will be provided for the disruption of organised criminal groups indicator and the Home Office will work to align the data requirement from Forces with the current ACPO crime mapping exercise to limit the bureaucratic burden. The Home Office will also continue to work with the ACPO Serious and Organised Crime business group to monitor the developing work on harm reduction with a view to introduce a related indicator from April 2009.

3.56 The ongoing development of APACS counter terrorism indicators has been a regular agenda item at the Police Counter Terrorism Board, which is a sub group of the National Policing Board and where stakeholders are represented. Overall for CT, feedback has been negative whilst acknowledging the considerable effort undertaken to reach this point in a very complex area of policing and service delivery. Views range from a desire to have no quantitative indicators for terrorism (preferring instead for HMIC to report on progress in this area) to concerns regarding the usefulness of individual indicators and their perceived perverse incentives. Other views expressed were that the indicators taken as a whole do not comprehensively represent the total policing / community safety effort, nor do they reflect the significant capacity and capability building that is currently underway. Despite considerable interaction with stakeholders and operational staff, no alternative indicators were put forward. Work will continue on developing CT indicators, recognising the substantive feedback and stage of development in this area.

CONFIDENCE AND SATISFACTION

3.57 The Confidence and Satisfaction domain relies on data sourced from surveys and the consultation highlighted concerns over this, in particular how information sourced from different surveys could be compared to produce meaningful data. There were detailed comments on the definition of anti-social behaviour and whether satisfaction with service delivery could be reliably measured.

- Q7.** *What do consultees feel about the measure of user satisfaction for victims of anti-social behaviour. Is this the right measure? How could it be improved? We have considered using a proxy measure for criminal damage in its place. Would this be the right solution?*
- Q8.** *Should the measure of user satisfaction include victims of road traffic collisions?*
- Q9.** *Should the measure of user satisfaction only account for 'completely and very' satisfied responses, rather than 'completely, very and fairly' satisfied responses as at present?*
- Q10.** *Do the proposed measures represent the appropriate proxies for public confidence in community safety services?*
- Q11.** *Views are invited on whether the Place Survey proposals (as set out in the upcoming CLG consultation paper) provide a suitable source for the relevant performance indicators in APACS?*
- Q12.** *What indicators would usefully form a suite of indicators for neighbourhood management? Should they be comprised of mainly survey measures from the promoting safety and confidence and satisfaction domains or should they also include non-survey data from other sources, including crime data?*

Comments & Suggestions

3.58 Concerns were expressed with regard to the **Place Survey** (see above under *Promoting Safety*).

3.59 Significant concerns were voiced over the feasibility of the anti-social behaviour 'victim' indicator on **satisfaction with service delivery**. It was suggested that this measure should be developed further before inclusion in APACS, reflecting the problems encountered with anti-social behaviour survey collection in forces. The definition of anti-social behaviour and of a 'victim' of anti-social behaviour also needed to be resolved. One suggestion was that the term 'victim' could be replaced by 'complainant'.

3.60 Stakeholders felt that the idea of using satisfaction levels for **criminal damage as a proxy measure for anti-social behaviour** was not appropriate, since criminal damage is a crime, whereas anti-social behaviour incidents may not involve a crime but can destroy quality of life for individuals and communities.

3.61 In terms of consideration of **user satisfaction** results, a strong preference was put forward for the retention of the current definition based on *completely, very and fairly* satisfied, because of the potential adverse effect on public confidence. It was also suggested that the satisfaction gap between white and ethnic minority victims might also be affected by a change.

3.62 Although there were sampling and conceptual concerns with the inclusion of road traffic collisions in the **user satisfaction** data, it was felt that the data on road traffic collisions should be retained as it is the only non-crime contributor to the indicator.

3.63 Concerns were raised about the wording of the **Understanding local concerns (agencies)** indicator and the relation to the perceived outcomes. Comments were received on the proposed indicator on **comparative satisfaction with service delivery (police)**, reflecting concerns with the existing PPAF measure due to sample sizes and confidence intervals. Stakeholders also felt that the indicator does not recognise improved satisfaction of both groups where the gap between has not reduced significantly.

3.64 For the indicators on **service delivery and effectiveness and fairness of the CJS**, some stakeholders felt that additional diagnostic information was necessary, as there would be a need to be able to link the outcome to specific inputs so that organisations and partnerships can take appropriate action and identify best practice.

3.65 Concerns were raised with regards to time lags and sample size with **WAVES data**.

Decisions and Rationale

3.66 For user satisfaction data, an assessment based on *completely, very and fairly satisfied* has been retained. This was recommended by most stakeholders and was felt to be an appropriate means of assessing satisfaction.

3.67 The Home Office feels that indicators which seek people's views (for example on whether local agencies understand local concerns) are important measures in considering how the police and agencies engage with the community, and also in improving public confidence. The indicators on understanding local concerns and dealing with local concerns also seek people's views regardless of whether they deal with agencies or the police.

3.68 In view of the difficulties with the introduction of indicators on satisfaction with service delivery for anti-social behaviour, these indicators have been delayed for introduction in 2009/10 at the earliest.

ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT

3.69 The APACS consultation document recognised that the Organisational Management Domain needed further development, both in terms of better measures and new measures reflecting wider perspectives of business within the police service and across partnerships. A number of specific questions relating to 2009/10 developments were asked directly, including:

Q13. How might efficiency and productivity be further captured within the framework?

Q14. Do the Organisational Management placeholders identified for 2009/10 reflect the key areas for development? What might be the most appropriate measures in these areas (e.g. leadership, collaboration, business process, etc?)

Q15. What other measures could be developed to support the Organisational Management domain? What would the best measures be for:

- a) Productive use of time / effective deployment (e.g. as captured through Staffordshire's measure of the match between supply and demand).
- b) Key process benchmarks? (e.g. benchmarks of key processes in terms of time, quality, staff / officer ratios, etc.)

Q16. How should we best assess how forces and authorities are using benchmarking to drive performance and improve productivity? (e.g. through reduced cost and increased quality?)

Comments & Suggestions

3.70 The **Organisational Management domain** was seen by many stakeholders as too police centric, with varying views about whether the domain should or should not be developed to cover partnership working (for example by including the hallmarks of effective partnership working. (see 2.7 and 2.10)). Reflecting this, the domain title was seen as inappropriate by some.

3.71 For **sickness absence**, in addition to general concerns about data quality, some stakeholders felt that the police officer and police staff measures should be combined into a single indicator. Likewise for **minority ethnic recruitment**, some felt that the indicator should also include PCSOs and other staff. There was also a suggestion to align the ethnic minority and female officer indicators to focus both on either recruitment or retention.

3.72 The **efficiency measures** drew some criticism from stakeholders, since it is seen as a very narrow assessment of performance against target. Stakeholders generally supported the inclusion of the Audit Commission's Police Use of Resources (PURE) assessment.

3.73 In terms of **placeholders**, stakeholders noted that these should be considered alongside developments from Sir Ronnie Flanagan's Review of Policing, and also the

upcoming Green Paper. There was little support for placeholder proposals relating to benchmarking measures.

Decisions and Rationale

3.74 Reflecting the general decision on domain names (as set out at paragraph 2.12) the domain name remains as *Organisational Management*, although further consideration may be given to this issue when considering the public-facing assessment.

3.75 The Home Office recognises that further work is needed on sickness absence measures, which are being progressed by the Police Productivity Unit and which are supported by ACPO. The APACS Steering Group agreed to retain separate indicators for police officers and police staff.

3.76 Similarly, expanding the minority ethnic recruitment indicator beyond police officers was not - on balance - supported by the Steering Group. The current indicator retains the focus on police officers.

3.77 For efficiency, the existing indicator has been retained for inclusion as it reflects performance against targets which underpin the efficiency and productivity strategy and this will have to be assessed over the whole of the CSR 2007 period to 2010/11. Acknowledging the criticisms of the efficiency indicator, further work continues to develop a broader indicator for 2009/10.

3.78 The aspiration to include the PURE judgement within APACS is supported, and further discussions with the Audit Commission are underway.

CONCLUSION

3.79 Consultation feedback was considered alongside feedback from related events, technical and other fora, and from feedback related to the consultations on the National Indicator Set for local government in England, and the Place Survey (both of which were run by CLG, in conjunction with the APACS consultation). Views from Ministers were also sought, both within the Home Office, and as part of wider Cabinet clearance of the National Indicator Set.

3.80 Final decisions were made in March, and were communicated to Forces and Authorities. The final indicator set for APACS was laid as a Statutory Instrument, with supporting technical guidance available on the Home Office website. In addition, CLG have published technical guidance relating to the full set of NIS indicators. (However, it is worth noting that the APACS technical guidance covers all APACS indicators, without need for cross reference to the NIS guidance).

3.81 The full list of APACS SPIs for 2008/09 is attached at Annex A, and the allocation by domain is set out at Annex B.

The APACS technical guidance is available at:

<http://police.homeoffice.gov.uk/performance-and-measurement/assessment-methods/assessment-technical-guidance/>

The (Department for) Communities and Local Government (CLG) guidance on the National Indicator Set (NIS) for Local Government in England is available here:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/finalnationalindicators>

4: PROPOSED DIAGNOSTIC INDICATORS

This section considers feedback on the proposed Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs), and provides greater clarity on the role of these indicators in support of the APACS framework. It also proposes new terminology to support the clarity of roles.

INTRODUCTION

4.1 The consultation paper set out proposals for a set of Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs), additional to the SPIs, that are not assessed as indicators of outcome performance nor published routinely but which provide important information to understand performance. Some such indicators would provide additional information to enable practitioners to “drill down” beyond the headline indicators; others would provide information in areas of business where no one indicator is strong enough to be assessed alone as a direct measure of outcome performance. The term KDIs was also used in the consultation paper to cover indicators which were being developed for possible inclusion from 2009/10 onwards (and in particular indicators relating to CT). Views were sought from stakeholders on the scope and balance of the set of diagnostic indicators proposed.

Q17. Views are invited on the inclusion – in principle – of a limited number of Key Diagnostic Indicators where inclusion would facilitate the understanding of headline performance data.

Q18. Views are invited on the proposals for KDIs at Annex F, focusing on any key omission or revisions (especially with respect to efficiency data).

Comments & Suggestions

4.2 Significant concerns were raised by many stakeholders about what was perceived as an excessive number of KDIs proposed (and in particular the number proposed to support the PPO SPI). In addition, concerns were expressed about the bureaucratic implications of the large number of KDIs (around 100 were proposed within the consultation document), and non-policing partners were particularly concerned that this would go against Government commitments to the new National Indicator Set for local government working alone or in partnership.

4.3 Responses to the APACS consultations and debate at a number of APACS forums indicated that there is a need for clarity on the role of Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs), reflecting that KDIs has been used as a blanket term to cover different types of indicators. Stakeholders also sought clarity on exactly how KDIs would be used.

4.4 In addition to concerns relating to the burdens of collecting and reporting data, some stakeholders were concerned that the proposed KDI set goes against the commitment to focus on the national priorities only.

Decisions & Rationale

4.5 Only indicators set as Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs) will be subject to formal public-facing assessment by the Home Office – ‘performance against’ KDIs will not be assessed in the public-facing APACS assessment. (Though it is recognised that HMIC – as an independent inspectorate - could draw on non-SPIs or other available information in coming to an inspection judgement.)

4.6 In addition to what is included in published assessments, supplementary information is used by both practitioners and the Home Office to monitor ongoing local delivery performance. Some non-SPIs will provide useful context to understand the drivers or determinants of headline (SPI) performance, whilst others will provide insight into performance against objectives not readily understood through (for example) a single SPI. Furthermore, easy access to comparative analysis on diagnostic indicators – for example through iQuanta – will often be of immense value to practitioners in understanding and interpreting performance. Taken in isolation, the information contained within the SPI set is not sufficient for the management and monitoring of service delivery, at any level – local, regional, or national.

4.7 The Home Office accepts that the collection and submission of data needs to be proportional, but reinforces the fact that effective performance management – based around appropriate measurement and monitoring of service delivery – is fundamentally important to good management of public services. Such performance management must be informed by a wide enough source of information about what is happening on the ground.

4.8 In considering the burden of non-SPIs it is recognised that there is a considerable amount of data which is already captured by central government, and the Home Office has committed to reviewing data collection as a contribution to the government wide target to reduce the burden of data that central government imposes on the public sector frontline by 30%. However, most of the diagnostic information is based on information requirements that already exist, and which therefore represents little/no *additional* burden on stakeholders for the collection of this data. It is important to recognise that formalising the set of diagnostic data brings better clarity around what is being or should be used to understand performance across a whole range of issues that were previously considered separately, but in itself does not represent an increased burden of data collection. It is also a necessary first step in ensuring that the data collected is the minimum, necessary, level.

4.9 Whilst developing indicators known as ‘aspiring SPIs’ (i.e. those proposed as SPIs for the future) sometimes do create new data burdens, the statutory nature of the headline indicators (SPIs) requires consultation and testing with stakeholders ahead of the next performance year, and it is right that these are considered with the non-SPIs in order to ensure that they are fit for purpose.

Clarification of roles and definitions of non-SPIs

4.10 Taken together, SPIs and non-SPIs provide a set of indicators that allow performance on key outcomes to be analysed and monitored. The APACS SPIs are a subset of these indicators which are:

4.10.1. **Statutory.** Defined by Statutory Instrument and subject to formal consultation with tripartite partners.

4.10.2. **Formally assessed.** Performance against that indicator is graded for inclusion within a public facing APACS assessment.

4.11 Other indicators fall outside of this definition. They are neither statutory nor form part of a formal APACS assessment. However, the use of the term 'Key Diagnostic Indicators' as a catch-all category is misleading. Instead, these indicators divide into three groups:

Aspiring SPIs

4.12 Aspiring SPIs have been identified as suitable in principal for inclusion as headline SPI measures in APACS. There may, for example, be doubts about the current quality of the data collected or not all forces currently collect data.

4.13 **Example:** Sanction detection rate for Hate Crime. This is aspiring because data is not collected by all forces in 2008/09, and will be considered for introduction for 2009/10.

4.14 Aspiring SPIs are being developed as new (SPI) indicators for 2009/10, in particular to replace current placeholders, and proposed SPIs that have now been delayed. Indicators in this category would be expected to either be awarded SPI status in the future, or – if not strong enough – might be considered useful as 'gap indicators' (below). Otherwise they would be removed from the framework in time.

Supporting Diagnostics / Contextual indicators

4.15 These directly support, and are linked to, an SPI. They are not used to assess outcome performance, but to further understand the apparent performance that is suggested by an SPI. There is no presumption that Supporting Diagnostics will become SPIs.

4.16 **Example:** Domestic burglary rate. This indicator represents an important subset of the APACS SPI "serious acquisitive crime rate".

4.17 In some cases supporting diagnostic indicators might also act as a form of gap indicator (below), for example for aspiring SPIs – they would provide some information on local delivery in an area of business in the absence of outcome data from an aspiring SPI in the first instance. **Example:** Drugs Intervention Programme indicators (and the drug-related offending aspiring SPI).

Gap Indicators

4.18 Some policing and community safety business areas are not represented in APACS. Gap indicators can be used to inform performance management in key business areas that APACS SPIs do not, for what ever reason, cover. However, crucially, they cannot be assessed directly for a published assessment of performance. More likely they will need to be interpreted alongside additional information (e.g. from other indicators).

4.19 **Example:** Rape offences. Rape offences do not qualify as an SPI as the level of recorded crime is too low for statistical analysis and there is directional ambiguity in the indicator's direction of travel. Nevertheless, policy makers and service deliverers will use data in this key crime type to ask questions about and thereby inform the improvement of service delivery.

5: OTHER ISSUES

This section covers a number of other issues raised in response to the consultation.

INTRODUCTION

5.1 This section summarises a number of other issues raised in response to the consultation.

TERMINOLOGY

5.2 Confusion over some of the terminology used by APACS was a common theme, with some stakeholders feeling that the term 'domain' will have a confused meaning for the public and should be renamed 'Performance Area'. The title of some indicators needed to be more appropriately worded, and some felt that a standardised approach to the use of the word "local" would also be helpful.

5.3 The Home Office will continue to consider whether terminology is appropriate, seeking guidance from the APACS User Group as necessary.

SURVEYS

5.4 Numerous concerns were raised about the survey based measures within APACS, especially around sampling sizes being too small in some areas, and around data collection. Stakeholders felt that there may be an opportunity to simplify arrangements for collecting surveys, and that central government could better co-ordinate surveys. The resources required to obtain meaningful data were also a source of concern.

5.5 Significant concern has been voiced about the new Place Survey proposed by CLG, but concerns were also raised about existing (British Crime Survey) arrangements. In particular, concerns focussed on whether the BCS results were meaningful and locally actionable in some areas, in part reflecting wide confidence intervals. Increased sample sizes were seen as desirable by some, but need to be balanced against concerns about resources (including cost and time). The Place Survey gave greater concern to stakeholders, noting that the proposed model is for a postal survey conducted every two years, which it was felt would not provide robust, meaningful or actionable information for local authorities or their partners. Some felt that many local authorities already have better arrangements in place, for example Citizens' Panels.

5.6 Whilst concerns about surveys are recognised, there is an important need to retain a focus on confidence and satisfaction and perceptions, particularly to underpin PSAs 23 and 25. Concerns about the Place Survey in particular continue to be examined, and the Home Office is in close discussion with CLG to try to ensure that the survey can be made more useful in support of APACS. Over the course of 2008/09, consideration will be given as to whether a survey can be developed to

capture data to support an indicator on the satisfaction with service delivery for 'victims' of anti-social behaviour.

OVERLAP

5.7 A number of the proposed indicators were considered as having significant overlap with each other, which some stakeholders felt was not desirable.

5.8 Whilst it is recognised that some of the indicators proposed for APACS have an element of overlap, there are only a small number of overlaps that are particularly significant. As the development of APACS continues – and in particular when considering how to derive a public facing assessment – potential issues relating to overlap in the framework will be monitored on an ongoing basis. In addition, some indicators are included as a matter of emphasis within the framework. For example, there is a clear policy focus to tackle both alcohol and drug-related ASB as a matter of priority.

COMPARABILITY

5.9 Some stakeholders were concerned that some of the proposed indicators would not be available or comparable across all areas.

5.10 As the framework develops to cover more complex and emerging issues, there is a need to have a framework that prioritises the provision of information to local areas over the universal comparability of published assessment, whilst recognising the importance of both. For that reason, the Home Office supports the inclusion within the framework of SPIs that may not be available in all areas, although it is recognised that this is a small number of indicators. In addition, a number of indicators were delayed in order to ensure that underpinning systems are rolled out for wider coverage.

6: SUMMARY

6.1 This document summarises the main concerns, issues and suggestions raised in response to the Technical Consultation, and details how the Home Office considered and responded to these issues, following further discussion with stakeholders, including the APACS Steering Group, and Ministers.

6.2 The Home Office is now working to finalise the overall arrangements for APACS, following the strategic consultation, which will in particular consider public facing assessments, the link to Comprehensive Area Assessment (CAA), balance of qualitative and quantitative components, balance of local and national priorities and wider support arrangements.

6.3 The Home Office will continue to work with partners to develop APACS throughout 2008/09, including the wider strategic development summarised above, and the further development of indicators for 2009/10.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who responded to the consultation

Annex A: 2008/09 APACS Statutory Performance Indicators (SPIs)

SPI number	NI number	Short title	PSA
1.1		Satisfaction with service delivery (Police)	24
1.2		Comparative satisfaction with service delivery (Police)	
1.3		Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents)	
1.4		Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS)	24
2.1	27	Understanding local concerns (agencies)	
2.2	21	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	23
2.3		Residents perception of police performance	
2.4		Effectiveness of the CJS	24
2.5		Fairness of the CJS	24
3.1		Minority ethnic police officer recruitment	
3.2		Female police officer representation	
4.1	17	Perception of anti-social behaviour	23
4.2	41	Perception of drunk or rowdy behaviour	25
4.3	42	Perception of drug use/drug dealing	25
5.1	15	Serious violent crime rate	23
5.2	16	Serious acquisitive crime rate	23
5.3	20	Assaults with less serious injury rate	
5.4	34	Domestic homicide rate	
5.5	29	Gun crime rate	
5.6	28	Knife crime rate	
6.1		Serious violent offences brought to justice	24
6.2		Serious acquisitive offences brought to justice	24
6.3		Sanction detection rate for racially and religiously aggravated crimes	
6.4		Serious sexual offences brought to justice	24
7.1	33	Deliberate fires	
8.1		Asset recovery	
9.1	47	Road traffic casualties	
10.1	30	Prolific and other Priority Offender re-offending rate	
11.1	18	Adult re-offending rate	23
11.2	19	Youth re-offending rate	23
11.3	111	First time youth offending	14
12.1		Police service efficiency	
13.1		Police officer sickness absence rate	
13.2		Police staff sickness absence rate	

Annex B: 2008/09 APACS SPIs by domain

PROMOTING SAFETY	TACKLING CRIME	SERIOUS CRIME & PROTECTION	CONFIDENCE & SATISFACTION	ORGANISATIONAL MANAGEMENT
Perception of anti-social behaviour	Serious acquisitive crime rate	Serious violent crime rate	Understanding local concerns (agencies)	Police efficiency
Perception of drunk / rowdy behaviour	Assault with injury rate	Gun crime rate	Dealing with local concerns (agencies)	Officer sickness absence rate
Perception of drug use / drug dealing	Bringing serious acquisitive crime offences to justice	Serious knife crime rate	Residents' perception of police performance	Police staff sickness absence rate
Arson and deliberate fire	Priority offender re-offending rate	Bringing serious violent offences to justice	Satisfaction with service delivery (police)	Minority ethnic police officer recruitment
Road traffic casualties	Adult re-offending rate	Bringing serious sex offences to justice	Comparative satisfaction with delivery (police)	Female officer representation
	Youth re-offending rate	Asset recovery	Satisfaction with service delivery (racist incidents)	
	First-time youth offending	Domestic violence - homicide	Satisfaction with service delivery (CJS)	
	Detection rate for racially & religiously aggravated crime		Effectiveness of the CJS	
			Fairness of the CJS	